



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1080/19463014.2017.1328700](https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2017.1328700)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Szczepek Reed, B. (2017). Creating space for learner autonomy: an interactional perspective. *Classroom Discourse*, 8(2), 175-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2017.1328700>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Creating space for learner autonomy: An interactional perspective

This paper is concerned with teachers' and learners' collaborative pursuit of learner autonomy in a highly asymmetrical education setting, the music masterclass. Evaluations are identified as a potential opportunity for the mutual construction of learner autonomy. The analysis shows that, while teaching professionals mitigate interactional inequalities and thus reflexively handle asymmetrical interaction, words alone do not address the imbalances that exist. It is only when teachers show determination in pursuing invitations for students to engage and provide sequential slots for them to do so that spaces for learner autonomy are created. Students are also shown to take charge of their own learning by evaluating themselves, rather than waiting for teachers to do so. The data show that, while interactional asymmetries can be deeply ingrained in traditional forms of instruction, the local co-construction of social life means that patterns of instruction can be negotiated in situ rather than being the inevitable result of established hierarchies. However, doing so requires considerable interactional effort.

Keywords: instruction; performance; masterclass; music education; conversation analysis

Introduction

An accepted pedagogical viewpoint, at least in the so-called Western world, is that learner-teacher interaction is at its most effective when learners are actively engaged in the instructional discourse (Barnes and Todd 1995; Hardman and Abd-Kadir 2010; Wells 1999). Most educational settings do not provide an equal playing field from the start; instead, epistemic asymmetries between expert and non-expert participants are made manifest in patterns of asymmetrical interaction. This study investigates the music masterclass where such asymmetries can be observed frequently. However, the data below show that even in the most asymmetrical setting it is possible for participants to carve out space for learner engagement and autonomy. The study contributes to a small body of conversation analytic work on music and music-related

instruction (Haviland 2011; Keevallik 2010; Nishizaka 2006; Reed 2015; Tolins 2013; Weeks 1985, 1996) as well as to a wider field of research on institutional interaction (Heritage and Clayman 2010), showing that how participants in interaction relate to each other within a certain setting is not pre-determined by a given context, but instead the way settings and role distributions are enacted is determined by actors themselves.

Methodology and data

This research follows a conversation analytic approach (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974; Schegloff 2007), which means that analyses are based on the observable behaviours of those taking part in interaction, the participants themselves. Behaviours are interpreted in light of previous and subsequent observed behaviours within the same interaction, as well as with reference to existing literature on talk-in-interaction. Claims regarding instructional practices are based on the detailed turn-by-turn analysis of 16 hours of video recordings of music masterclasses, one set organised by the Music department of a UK university and the other by a UK music charity. Representative sequences have been extracted for presentation below. All masterclass participants, including all audience members, consented to being recorded and to the anonymised use of their data for academic research and its dissemination. The transcripts show those aspects of interactions that are relevant to the analysis at hand; many spoken and embodied actions are not represented in order to maintain readability. Transcripts are considered a flawed but useful aid to representation rather than data in themselves (Ashmore and Reed 2000).

Music masterclass instruction and learner autonomy

Masterclasses are a traditional method for advanced music instruction (Haddon 2014;

Hanken 2008; Long et al. 2011, 2012). Student-performers are often proficient practitioners or early-career professionals themselves, while masters are established professionals who enhance their reputation and income by teaching publically in this way. Masterclasses are held in front of an audience, typically made up of peer musicians. As educational events they are therefore high stakes for the participants involved, as both teaching and learning are on public display and up for external scrutiny.

The structure of a typical masterclass has been described in Reed and Szczepk Reed (2013). Following the student-performer's entrance and their brief introduction of the musical piece, there is routinely a first performance, which is often the only time the piece is performed from beginning to end. Subsequently, the majority of the class is spent working on specific matters for instruction and improvement, referred to here as *learnables* following Koschmann and Zemel (2011), which emerge spontaneously from the first performance and subsequent learner-tutor interaction. Typical learnables concern artistic expression and interpretation as well as instrumental or vocal technique. Learnables in music education are almost always multimodal in nature, although conventional known answer question sequences (Schegloff 2007) and other primarily verbal learnables also occur in the data.

During the collaborative pursuit of learnables, masters' instructional practices display a spectrum of opportunities for learner engagement. The way learnables are initially established varies from very tutor-centred practices, such as masters drawing inspiration exclusively from their own expertise and experience; to varying degrees of inclusion of student-performers, such as masters drawing on their expressed experience of and reaction to the student's performance; to more learner-centred practices, such as masters eliciting from learners themselves as well as from the

audience what their experience of the performance was and constructing the session around this feedback (Reed and Szczepk Reed 2014). Once learnables have been established, instruction typically takes the form of local and non-local action directives, that is, directives to perform a desired action now or to act in a certain way in future performances. Rarely are directives delivered as stand-alone instructions; instead, directive clusters of considerable length are delivered with limited opportunities for student-performers to respond verbally (Szczepk Reed, Reed, and Haddon 2013). Eventual compliance with local action directives is achieved when student-performers repeat specified parts of the musical piece. Repeat performances are opportunities to display learning and as such are typically initiated (Reed 2015) and evaluated (Reed, in press) by the master.

The following example from a vocal masterclass shows a representative instruction sequence. The master is in the process of advising a student-performer not to overuse a certain hand gesture. The master lays out a number of options and gives directives regarding what, and what not, to do. The student then re-performs the relevant part of the piece, trying not to use the gesture in question. His re-performance is interrupted by the master who evaluates it with a mitigated negative assessment, which is followed by another round of action directives.

Extract (1)

52.08 (Stephen Sondheim: *Johanna*)

```

1      MA:  consIder HOW you can DO FEELing. (.)
2          there there's SEVeral possibilities.
3          ONE I:s, (.)
4          er: you know an- ANYone can (do this);
5          One is that you are Opening yourself to FEELing
6          something.
      ((...continues instruction...))
7      MA:  anOther possibility is that (.) you FEEL her;
8      ST:  <<nods>>
9      MA:  nkay, (.)
10         but but you but DON'T put her in frOnt of you. (.)
11         [no but
12      ST:  [<<making ball shaped hand gesture>>
13      MA:  don't don't just DON'T DO that for-
```

14 ST: <<nods>>
15 MA: nOthing WRONG with it.
16 ST: <<nods>>
17 MA: but you CAN'T use it forEver.
18 ST: <<nods>>
19 MA: <<walks off stage>>
((comment by audience member, student performs briefly, makes the ball shaped gesture, stops, then starts again))
20 ST: <<performs>-----[->
21 MA: [STOP;
22 now uh (.) LISten i'm just trying to-
23 forGIVE me;
24 [((-))
25 ST: [<<nodding> yeah yeah;>
26 MA: you're you're (.) you're trEating this song Also very
27 RHYTHmically. (-)
28 which is [sOmething you do very WELL.=
29 ST: [<<nods>>
30 MA: i GET that i say i say i've seen you perform beFORE so;
31 <<four enactments of jerky upper body movements, hands
32 held out to the side> ah ah ah ah>
33 ST: <<nods>>
34 MA: but this is l- this LINE;
35 is comPLETEly Open.
36 ST: <<nods>>
37 MA: <<singing> da di::: di::: di>
38 we don't have to see an Impulse ANYwhere.
39 ST: <<nods>>
40 MA: the WHOLE gesture (.) for thIs thing;
41 COULD be-
42 ST: [<<nods>>
43 MA: [<<motioning towards ST> i'm just a- asSIGNing you this
44 task cause it's STRANGE to you.>
45 ST: <<nods>>
46 MA: <<opening arms> the whOle gesture for this thing could be
47 just Opening and reCEI:Ving.> (-)
48 VERYy SLOWly, (-)
49 but VERY convincing.

In the course of this instruction sequence the master repeatedly displays awareness of existing interactional asymmetries regarding the unequally distributed right to speak and to assess. For example, at line 4 he briefly includes the audience in his address, and at lines 21-25 he apologises for interrupting the student and is granted permission to continue. This shows a reflexive engagement by both participants with the more broadly enacted roles as instructor and learner. However, both the apology and the student's granting of permission work to cement an existing distribution of rights rather than providing a genuine opportunity for negotiating or challenging these rights. Neither do they create opportunities for engagement. Nevertheless, the fact that

participants *do* negotiating shows that they are reflexively managing interactional constraints on the use of power, here the power to stop another participant's action in its tracks. As he continues, the master initially offers a positive evaluation of the student's performance (lines 26-28); however, this acts as a preface to eventual criticism (lines 34-38) and to a directive for modified behaviour (lines 40-49), with the directive itself being treated as requiring justification by the master (lines 43-44). The extract shows the interactional asymmetries and constraints on learner engagement that are frequently found in the masterclass format, as well as participants' displayed awareness and reflexive treatment of them. It also shows that verbal mitigation of inequalities does not in itself further learner engagement.

In recent decades, Western approaches to education have embraced the concept of learner-centredness, with a focus on learner autonomy emerging initially from the field of language education as "the ability to take charge of one's own learning" (Holec 1981, 3). The term *learner autonomy* has been used to describe a number of concepts, but is used here as referring to "the right of learners to determine the direction of their own learning", in particular with regard to a "redistribution of power attending the construction of knowledge and the roles of the participants in the learning process" (Thanasoulas 2000, 1). The pedagogical approach of the music masterclass is based on the one-to-one master-apprentice model that has traditionally dominated music education in the West (Creech and Gaunt 2012) and offers limited scope for learner autonomy, at least when enacted in its conventional format. It is further characterized by the kinds of asymmetries with regard to turn taking and the pursuit of social actions that are typical for institutional interactions more generally (Heritage and Clayman 2010), as well as by a strong focus on directive giving (Szczepek Reed, Reed, and Haddon 2013). Nevertheless, the interactionally achieved

nature of the teaching process affords learners and teachers opportunities to influence the direction of the session, and of their learning. The data below show that this is not necessarily dependent on masters' provision of opportunities for learner engagement. Even during very directive-dominant sessions, student-performers can find ways of influencing the trajectory towards their own interests. Vice versa, a master's invitation to engage does not necessarily lead to learner engagement, either because of a lack of uptake or because verbal elicitations are not followed up by actual opportunities for learners to act. In other words, reflexivity alone is not enough to change the course of a historically embedded course of action. Learner autonomy, like other concepts related to interactional hierarchy, is collaboratively accomplished rather than necessarily pre-established in a given interactional format or genre (Maynard 1991). What will become clear from the data shown below, however, is that active collaboration by both participants is crucial in this equation.

One locus for learner engagement and autonomy occurs during the evaluation of students' performances. Evaluations may occur in the final slot of the initiation – response – feedback / evaluation sequence (IRF / IRE) originally described by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Mehan (1979). IRE sequences occur frequently during masterclasses, as they do in most instructional settings (Walsh 2011). Masters frequently use single turns such as “excellent” or “good” to show receipt of a performance and to close an instructional sequence, often providing no sequential slot for a response (Reed in press). Such evaluations position learners as being on the receiving end of expert opinion without an opportunity for anything but tacit acknowledgment and potential compliance with any implied suggestions for improvement. Unlike some other forms of assessment, evaluations that are delivered as part of an instructional sequence do not initiate or elicit second assessments, but

instead are sequence-closing (see, for example, Mondada 2009). Evaluation can also take the form of a longer interactional project, involving instructional commentary, justification, mitigation of criticism and invitations to engage. In both cases evaluations are high stakes, as they represent an opportunity, even an obligation, for masters to display expertise as well as pedagogic competence, not only to the student-performer but also to the audience.

Findings

The extracts below show that, even in the institutionally constrained pedagogical structure of the music masterclass, both tutors and learners negotiate opportunities for learner engagement and autonomy. The evaluation practices presented below range from initiation and full evaluation by the master; to initiation by the master with an invitation that some of the evaluating work be done by learners themselves (including the audience); to initiation and full evaluation by learners. In the second and third cases student-performers are provided with an interactional opportunity to “take charge of [their] own learning”; however, the degree of granting and active take-up of such opportunities varies and seems to be influenced by specific sequence design features. All practices in this corpus that successfully engage learners have in common that participants open up the interactional space following an evaluation to provide an opportunity for learners to participate beyond mere compliance. Below a representative case of an evaluation without an opportunity for learner engagement is shown before three practices for active engagement-seeking are presented.

Learner engagement not invited

Like other one-to-one instruction settings, masterclasses provide frequent occasions for teachers to assess an immediately preceding learner performance. Evaluations are

therefore common and they often follow the IRE pattern in which the evaluation closes the sequence. At the same time, and due to the cyclical nature of instruction giving, evaluations also often initiate the next sequence. In the following extract from a vocal masterclass, the master interrupts a student's re-performance almost as soon as it has started, just as the first note is being sung and played. He does so with an evaluation, having initiated the re-performance verbally first (not shown) and then by leaving the stage (lines 1-2). The master's reference to being "together" (lines 7-8) refers to the pianist's and singer's joint start of the piece.

Extract (2)

1.14.42 (Beethoven: *An die ferne Geliebte*)

```
1      MA:   uh it's Up to YOU.
2           <<walks off stage>>
3      ST:   <<adopts pre-performance home position1>>
4           <<performs>>---[->
5      MA:               [now [STARTing this jUst as (I think) uh -
6      ST:               [<<visibly exhales, drops shoulders>>
7      MA:   it wasn't (.) QUITE together then and it wAsn't quite
8           together beFORE. .hh
9           uh: (.) you've just BOTH got to (.) beLIEVE that it's
10          going to be THERE;
```

The evaluation *it wasn't quite together then and it wasn't quite together before*

interrupts the re-performance and brings an ongoing instruction cycle to an end.

Simultaneously, it opens up a new instruction sequence: while the master's previous instruction was concerned with the performance being too "passive" (see 2a below), this evaluation is directed instead at the timing of the onset of the piece. With regard to learner engagement, it is clear from this example – as indeed from (1), above – that

¹ See Jensenius et al. (2010, 20)

It is possible to define the home position of a performer to be the resting position in which the performer sits or stands before starting to act (Sacks and Schegloff 2002). In a musical context, and particularly in Western classical music, this can be understood as when a musician is standing or sitting at ease with the instrument before starting to perform.

the instruction cycle leaves little room for learner responses outside the re-performance of the piece and physical displays of reciprocity, such as nodding (ex (1)) and the visible exhalation shown by this student-performer in response to being interrupted (line 6).² Crucially, the evaluation – arguably the point at which interactional asymmetry is at its most pronounced – is not followed by an opportunity for the student to respond. Instead, it is the starting point of another round of directives regarding a new learnable and thus the beginning of a new instruction sequence. It is this interactional location that masters and student-performers can manipulate to provide opportunities for learner engagement and even autonomy.

Learner engagement invited but not granted

As could be seen in extract (1) masters may reflexively manage the unequal distribution of rights to speak and to evaluate. Such displayed awareness and desire to mitigate any imbalance can be expressed by offering evaluations, as well as compliance with any implied change in behaviour, up for negotiation. In the following interaction, which occurs immediately prior to that represented in (2), the master evaluates the student's previous re-performance (line 16). He does so following lengthy commentary and directive giving (not shown in its entirety here), which ends in the final evaluation (*maybe it was a bit passive*). The master's talk contains a number of mitigating comments, which culminate in an invitation to the learner to judge the appropriateness of his final evaluation for herself (line 19-21).

Extract (2a)

² Previous work has shown that learners can interactionally *claim* understanding through communicative behaviours such as nods, agreement tokens and the like, and *exhibit* understanding through production of the appropriate next action (Hindmarsh, Reynolds, and Dunne 2011).

1.14.09 (Beethoven: *An die ferne Geliebte*)

1 MA: would you LIKE to do it again an- and ACTually .h be more
2 VIVid with what you TELL us about those;
3 ST: oKAY,
4 MA: Even if it doesn't WO:RK;
5 i mean just i'd like for you to try and see the SCALE of
6 performance is what i'm sugGESTing.
7 (.)
8 ST: okay
9 MA: i KNOW there's a long way to GO in <<sweeping, pointing
10 arm gesture>> there's fifteen MINutes of this,
11 ST: <<nods and smiles>>
12 MA: but NEVertheLESS;
13 there's i thInk there's an A:Rdour [(.) about him. (-)
14 [<<ST looks away from
15 MA and at sheet music>>
16 and mAYbe it was a bit PASSive.
17 <<raises eyebrows, looks at ST, forward head movement>>
18 ST: [<<nodding> KAY.>
19 MA: [<<raised eyebrows, wide arm gesture> WAS it.
20 (-)
21 uh it's Up to YOU.>
22 <<walks off stage>>
23 ST: <<adopts pre-performance home position>>
24 <<performs>>---[->
25 MA: [now [STARTing this jUst as (I think) uh -
26 ST: [<<visibly exhales, drops shoulders>>
27 MA: it wasn't (.) QUITE together then and it wAsn't quite
28 together beFORE. .hh

Immediately after his delivery of the negative evaluation (line 16) the master raises his eyebrows, visibly seeks gaze alignment with the student, and mitigates his assessment (*was it*, line 19). Subsequently he hands over responsibility for the appropriateness of the assessment and its implementation to the learner, both verbally (*it's up to you*, line 21) and physically by leaving the stage area (line 22). He thus creates a potential opportunity for the student to take charge of whether and, if so, how she puts his instruction into practice. However, in spite of his verbal invitation to engage in this way, the master does not give the student access to this opportunity for very long. Instead, he interrupts the performance as soon as it has started with a negative evaluation of the performers' timing (see (2)), which is unrelated to the previous instruction on musical expression. He thus moves from one learnable to another without providing space for the first learnable and respective instruction to be put into practice; and without giving the student a chance to take the previously

offered responsibility for her own learning. The student reacts to this with a visible display of being stopped in her tracks, dropping her upper body and exhaling hearably, but without verbally challenging the new direction the masterclass is taking. The multimodal aspect of this interaction is relevant, as rights to speak are clearly enacted differently from rights to make visibly interpretable physical contributions. However, the course of action is being established by speaking and consequently by those who speak.

What can be seen from this example as well as from extract (1) is that masters *verbally* mitigate against the interactional asymmetry and potential threat to students' self-esteem that negative evaluations carry, for example, by complimenting students before delivering a negative assessment (*you're treating this song also very rhythmically which is something you do very well*), accepting accountability (*forgive me I'm just trying to...*), bringing up mitigating aspects of the musical piece (*I know there's a long way to go in there's fifteen minutes of this*) and opening up negative assessments for negotiation (*maybe it was a bit passive – was it? uh it's up to you*). While these practices manage inequalities reflexively and reveal an awareness that they are undesirable, the verbal mitigation alone does not lead to a redistribution of rights and opportunities. In extract (1) the negative evaluation is nevertheless delivered; the only opportunity for the student to contribute is in the form of nodding as a physical display of reciprocity (lines 37-52). In (2) the performance opportunity as well as the opportunity to challenge a previous assessment (an opportunity to which the student is invited) are overridden by the master's introduction of a new learnable almost as soon as the student performance has begun.

Reed and Szczepek Reed (2013) present a similar example where student participation is invited, but not granted. In their extract a master verbally invites the

student to choose the bar with which she would like to start her re-performance. Immediately upon asking the question, however, the master retracts the opportunity by continuing with his instruction. Multimodality once again plays an important role. The authors show that, by refusing to align his gaze with the student-performer, the master overrides any opportunity for uptake (Reed and Szczepek Reed 2013, 324). In order to change the interactional dynamics of an instruction sequence, a more robust intervention of the institutional setting is required.

Learner engagement invited and granted

Engaging learners beyond mere compliance and tacit displays of reciprocity requires not only effective elicitation by the master (including providing the time slot for students to engage more actively), but also uptake of such engagement opportunities by the student-performer. In the following example a master elicits engagement both from the audience and from the student, and both respond actively and over a considerable period of time. The master in question is the same individual as in (2), teaching a different student, which underlines the point that the practices described here are not a mark of pedagogic skill or success, but show different sequential designs within an institutionally constrained structure. The transcript starts with the end of the first full performance by the student. Rather unusually the student has sung and accompanied herself on the piano – a rare occurrence in classical music and one that is taken up as an item of discussion immediately upon her finishing.

Extract (3)

36.30 (Brahms: *An eine Äolsharfe*)

- | | | |
|---|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | ST: | <<ends performance>> |
| 2 | AU: | <<applause>> |
| 3 | MA: | whAt's - |
| 4 | | <<gets up from chair, enters stage area, turns to audience>> |
| 5 | | what's YOU:R response to hearing- (.) |
| 6 | | i mean has anybody HEARD a (.) a sInger sElf-acCompanied |

7 i mean in a perFORMance before.

8 AU1: no.

9 MA: you've obviously done it ((unintelligible))

10 has anybody DONE it; (-)

11 or has hEArD a perFORMance of it;

12 AU: <<murmuring>>

13 MA: it's quite a dIfferent e- e- e- exPERience. (-)

14 i mean espEcially thOse of us that knOW kathryn's VOICE.

15 .hh what i'd lIke to do just as an exPERiment;

16 is actually for YOU to sing it and I'LL PLAY it;

17 ST: KAY,

18 MA: an i'm- the REASON for doing this is not to listen to the

19 accOmpaniment at All;

20 but actually to listen to: (.) KATHryn.

21 ST: <<coughs>>

22 MA: and find (.) Is there a DIFFerence.

23 (-)

24 which she should be able to make Use of or NOT.

25 <<walking to piano> when she's (.) uh (.) PLAYing.>

((...re-performance accompanied by MA...))

26 MA: <<getting up from piano stool> NOW. (.)

27 WHAT was dIfferent.>

28 <<walks towards audience>>

29 and and this is this is pUrely for KATHryn's uh fEEDback;

30 so I thought there were a NUMber of dIfferences.

31 what did YOU: (.) perCEIVE.

32 AU1: I could TELL (.) much more EA:Sily;

33 the eMOtions you were trying to portray;

34 when you're not at the piAno.

35 ((...))

36 i found it EAsier to underSTAND.

37 ST: <<nodding> mhm;>

38 AU2: I think there WAS some ((unintelligible)) colour.

39 MA: YES.

40 AU2: than it was the second time.

41 ST: mhm -

42 AU2: and it wAsn't just the fact that we could see your FACE

43 ((unintelligible))

44 it really was a different sort of ((unintelligible))

45 ST: mhm;

46 mhm;

47 sOmething that's dIfficult for me to THINK about right

48 now;

((2.24 minutes of student-audience interaction without verbal contributions from MA))

49 MA: I I felt there were certainly THREE THINGS that were

50 dIfferent.

51 ST: <<nods>>

52 MA: One is that the TOP NOTE;

53 those E FLATS;

54 had REal supPORT;

55 and there was THEREfore a real exCITEment to them;

((...continues instruction...))

56 as there WAS in the vAughan Williams and i'm sure there

57 will be in the BEETHoven;

58 ST: yeah;

59 MA: uh: (-)

60 ST: well what I noticed (-) imMEdiately was (.) the SECond

61 time we we performed the song quite a bit FASTER.

62 MA: YEAH;

63 ST: and uhm; (.)

64 something i'm aWARE of;
65 when i'm accOmpanying myself is;
66 ((...))

The instructional interaction starts with the master facilitating a second performance (lines 3-26). He does so even before giving any instructions to the student-performer; instead, he elicits immediate responses from audience members and prepares the ground for a later discussion of learnables which are related to the contrast between performing self- or other-accompanied. One difference between this re-performance and all others in the data corpus is that it is not interrupted, but continues for the entire musical piece. Another fundamental difference is that it is set up initially as a learning and feedback opportunity *for the audience* (lines 3-12; 18-22), with the student-performer identified as the eventual beneficiary (lines 24-25, 27-30). This inclusion of all learners in a single learning opportunity, as well as the master's explicit and maintained pursuit of learner engagement (lines 3-25; 27-32) lead to an extended dialogue led by audience members and the student. The master initiates the interaction and participates verbally at first (lines 27-40). However, given the space and opportunity more audience members offer up evaluating turns-at-talk, with which the student-performer gradually begins to engage at some length (lines 38-51). This dialogic rather than mono-directional setting facilitates further student engagement after the master has taken the floor to deliver his own evaluation (lines 52-63). In what is an unusual turn for a music masterclass, the student-performer responds verbally by offering her own perspective and a justification for some of the performance features criticized by the master (lines 64-70). She thus takes an active part in the spoken construction of the evaluating process in addition to contributing her musical performance.

In contrast to (2a), where the student-performer is invited to engage with instructional content as part of her re-performance but is interrupted very soon

afterwards, this re-performance is successfully used as an opportunity for an autonomous and collaborative learning experience. The main difference lies in the participants' degree of (displayed) commitment to the creation of such an opportunity: while verbally expressed commitment shows awareness of unidirectional instruction as undesirable and in need of being mitigated, words alone do not become an interactional initiative unless they are accompanied by a subsequent time slot and opportunity for co-participation. The asymmetric tendencies of the masterclass mean that the creation of learner engagement opportunities require considerable commitment and interactional work: it is noticeable that, when the master verbally elicits student responses, he has to do so repeatedly to initiate an ongoing dialogue. His verbal invitations to engage are further accompanied by his embodied pursuit of physical proximity (lines 4, 27, 29). When he initially asks for a reaction from the audience (lines 3-7), only one audience member responds and does so with a monosyllable (line 8). Another attempt (lines 9-11) leads to unintelligible murmuring but no explicit responses (line 12). Following the re-performance, which in itself is an active creation of a new learning opportunity, the master again repeatedly invites audience feedback, walking towards the audience on his second attempt (lines 27-32) before one audience member replies in some detail, which starts off further interaction between the audience and the student-performer. In addition to engaging only a single learner, that is, the student-performer, the master also achieves the inclusion of the audience as *speaking* co-participants in this learning opportunity.

In pedagogical terms this means that, in order to create opportunities for learner autonomy, existing classroom structures have to be undermined actively and determinedly by the participant who has the influence to do so, that is, the teacher. In a setting where learners' roles are conventionally limited to receiving instructions and

complying with them, it is not enough to verbally encourage students to engage. A context in which instruction is based on the teaching professional's continuing evaluation of a student's performance will inadvertently lead to repeated interruptions, evaluations and suggestions for improvement. Instead, learner autonomy in the sense of "the ability to take charge of one's own learning" (Holec 1981, 3) requires repeated elicitation of engagement accompanied by the appropriate time allocation within the instructional sequence.

Self-initiated learner engagement

Another route into opportunities for learner autonomy in an asymmetrical setting is decisive initiative-taking by the learner. This can be found, for example, in the form of students' self-evaluation, where by assessing their own work they perform an action that is firmly within the master's accepted remit and role. By doing so they reverse the sequential positions of first and second actions and put the master in a responding position in contrast to the initiating slot s/he typically occupies. As with masters' invitations to engage, the success of self-initiated engagement relies on a significant disruption of the existing structure. In the case of self-evaluations this is achieved primarily through early timing, before the master's assessment slot has taken effect.

In the extract below the master has initiated a re-performance of parts of the piece and the student-performer interrupts her own singing with a negative assessment rather than waiting for the master to interrupt her with his. The instructional focus is on the musical phrasing of the word *schlummer*.

Extract (4)

13:06 (Weber: *Wie nahte mir der Schlummer - Leise, leise, fromme Weise*)

- 1 MA: and then you wAnt to AL:SO: (-) <<p> phrAse Off.>
2 ((the words)) you want to TAper.

3 ST: <<nodding> OKAY - >
 4 MA: ((6 syllables, unintelligible))
 5 ST: <<singing> wie nahte mir der schlummer>
 6 <<downward gaze> URGH>
 7 MA: <<downward gaze at sheet music on piano>>
 8 ST: <<seeks eye contact with MA>>
 9 MA: yEAh so you want der SCHLU::Mmer.
 10 ST: <<nodding> yeah.>
 11 MA: right,
 12 SCHLU::Mmer.
 13 .hh so you can ALmost throw aWAY that last sYllable.

In contrast to the majority of instruction sequences in the corpus, this re-performance is brought to an end by the performing student rather than the master. The singer takes the lead over the pianist and interrupts the performance with an assessing interjection (*urgh*, line 6) after she has emphasized the second syllable of the word *schlummer* more than she was instructed to do (lines 1-2). As she does so she drops her upper body and head, briefly collapsing in displayed frustration before raising her head again and seeking the master's gaze. It is clear from the master's body posture and gaze direction that he had not been preparing to interrupt the piece at this point: he is looking over the pianist's shoulder, reading the sheet music on the piano (line 7). He remains in this position for a moment once the student has stopped singing, not acknowledging the halt in the performance straight away. Eventually they both make eye contact and the master offers an instructional directive (line 9).

This non-verbal interaction shows the student to be looking for acknowledgement of her interruption and self-evaluation from the master. The lack of additional talk from her and her continued gaze at the master in anticipation of his response show her to have created a space for the master, rather than herself, to become actively involved. This shows an acceptance of the conventional distribution of roles – the master as the primary deliverer of instruction and assessment – but an active pursuit of input at a time specified by the student.

In order to place herself in a position to initiate rather than respond, the student has to self-evaluate before the master has a chance to do so. As the producer of the performance she is in the best position to achieve this: rather than having to wait for signs of completion as someone listening to the performance would be, she is in control of her own vocalization and can stop whenever necessary to produce a spoken turn-at-talk. Making use of this advantage has the benefit of guaranteed short-term success: commenting on their own performance before anyone else allows students to place themselves momentarily in an initiating position, when they spend the majority of their time responding to initiatives by masters. Clearly the sequentially longer-term success of this practice depends on the master's reaction: rather than engaging with the student's displayed perception of her own performance, this master does not stay with the self-assessment but instead offers new directives. However, by evaluating herself rather than waiting for someone else to do so, the student creates a space for autonomy, if only within the immediately following instructional interaction. In contrast to extract (3), where opportunities for learner autonomy are actively and engagedly created by the master, this example shows a learner forcibly and independently carving out a space for her own engagement. Unlike in extract (3), where remaining participants take up the opportunity for more multi-directional instruction, the master in this example does not cooperate in the same way.

Concluding observations

As a learning environment the music masterclass is a particularly asymmetrical setting. The right to speak and to assess is overwhelmingly exercised by masters, with student-performers primarily taking the position of receiving and complying with instructions. In order to create spaces for learner autonomy, significant and labour-

intensive measures to break up existing sequential structures are required. Reflexivity in the form of verbal mitigation of the unequal distribution of speaking and evaluation rights is not enough to bring about learner engagement and does not seem to be designed for such an outcome, but rather for prefacing upcoming criticism (extracts (1) and (2a)). The extracts above show that, in order to have a say in the direction of their own learning, learners need determined encouragement and, crucially, the sequential space to engage (extract (3)). The data also show that learners can create such opportunities themselves (extract (4)). However, both cases show that the teaching professional has a significant responsibility to step back from their role as initiator and assessor into one of facilitator and at times recipient.

Achieving learner autonomy is an interactionally demanding and time consuming endeavour. Multimodality plays a significant role in its achievement, especially where this involves negotiating rights to speak and rights to initiate actions. While most social activity is performed multimodally in one way or another, in spoken interaction it is those actions that are performed through speech that have the strongest influence on a developing course of action. In addition, initiating actions are typically more influential than responding ones. Thus, the party with the rights to speak and to initiate has the opportunity as well as the primary responsibility to address interactional asymmetries and create spaces for learner autonomy.

References

- Ashmore, Malcolm, and Darren Reed. 2000. "Innocence and Nostalgia in Conversation Analysis: The Dynamic Relations of Tape and Transcript." *Forum: Qualitative Research* 1 (3). <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1020>.
- Barnes, Douglas, and Frankie Todd. 1995. *Communication and Learning Revisited: Making Meaning Through Talk*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Creech, Andrea, and Helena Gaunt. 2012. "The Changing Face of Individual Instrumental Tuition: Value, Purpose and Potential." In *The Oxford Handbook of Music Education*, edited by Gary E. McPherson and Graham F. Welch, 694–711. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Haddon, Elizabeth. 2014. "Observational Learning in the Music Masterclass." *British Journal of Music Education* 31 (1): 55–68.
- Hanken, Ingrid M. 2008. "Teaching and Learning Music Performance: The Master Class." *Finnish Journal of Music Education* 11 (1-2): 26–36.
- Hardman, Frank, and Jan Abd-Kadir. 2010. "Classroom Discourse: Towards a Dialogic Pedagogy." In *The Routledge International Handbook of English, Language and Literacy Teaching*, edited by Dominic Wyse, Richard Andrews, and James Hoffman, 254–263. London: Routledge.
- Haviland, John B. 2011. "Musical Spaces." In *Embodied Interaction: Language and Body in the Material World*, edited by Jürgen Streeck, Charles Goodwin, and Curtis LeBaron, 289–304. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, John, and Steven Clayman. 2010. *Talk in Action. Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hindmarsh, John, Patricia Reynolds, and Stephen Dunne. 2011. "Exhibiting Understanding: The Body in Apprenticeship." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (2): 489–503.
- Holec, Henri. 1981. *Autonomy and Foreign Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Jensenius, Alexander R., Marcelo M. Wanderley, Rolf I. Godøy, and Marc Leman. 2010. "Musical Gestures: Concepts and Methods in Research." In *Musical Gestures. Sound, Movement, and Meaning*, edited by Rolf I. Godøy and Marc Leman, 12–35. New York: Routledge.
- Keevallik, Leelo. 2010. "Bodily Quoting in Dance Correction." *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 43 (4): 401–426.
- Koschmann, Timothy, and Alan Zemel. 2011. "Discovering the Learnable." Paper presented at 10th Conference of the International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis, Fribourg, Switzerland, July 10-14.

- Long, Marian, Andrea Creech, Helen Gaunt, Susan Hallam, and Linnhe Robertson. 2012. "Blast from the Past: Conservatoire Students' Experiences and Perceptions of Public Master Classes." *Musicae Scientiae* 16: 286–306.
- Long, Marian, Helen Gaunt, Susan Hallam, and Andrea Creech. 2011. "Mapping Masterclasses. Format, Content and Style." Final report. *Higher Education Academy*.
- Maynard, Douglas. 1991. "Interaction and Asymmetry in Clinical Discourse." *American Journal of Sociology* 97 (2): 448–495.
- Mehan, Hugh. 1979. *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mondada, Lorenza. 2009. "The Embodied and Negotiated Production of Assessments in Instructed Actions." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 42 (4): 329–361.
- Nishizaka, Aug. 2006. "What to Learn: The Embodied Structure of the Environment." *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 39 (2): 119–154.
- Reed, Darren. 2015. "Relinquishing in Musical Masterclasses: Embodied Action in Interactional Projects." *Journal of Pragmatics* 89: 31–49.
- Reed, Darren. In press. "Assessment Receipts in Pedagogic Interactions: the Case of Music Masterclasses." *Discourse Studies*.
- Reed, Darren, and Beatrice Szczepek Reed. 2013. "Building an Instructional Project: Actions as Components of Music Masterclasses." In *Units of Talk – Units of Action*, edited by Beatrice Szczepek Reed and Geoffrey Raymond, 313–341. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Reed, Darren, and Beatrice Szczepek Reed. 2014. "The Emergence of Learnables in Music Masterclasses." *Social Semiotics* 24 (4): 446–467.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel A. Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation." *Language* 50: 696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Selting, Margret, Peter Auer, Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Jörg Bergmann, Pia Bergmann, Karin Birkner, Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen et al. 2011. "A System for Transcribing Talk-in-Interaction: GAT 2" (translated and adapted for

- English by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Dagmar Barth-Weingarten).
Gesprächsforschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion 12: 1–51.
- Sinclair, John, and Malcolm Coulthard. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*.
 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Szczepek Reed, Beatrice, Darren Reed, and Elizabeth Haddon. 2013. “NOW or NOT
 NOW: Coordinating Restarts in the Pursuit of Learnables in Musical
 Masterclasses.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46 (1): 22–46.
- Thanasoulas, Dimitrios. 2000. “What is Learner Autonomy and How Can It Be
 Fostered?” *The Internet TESL Journal*. Accessed 9 August 2016.
<http://iteslj.org/Articles/Thanasoulas-Autonomy.html>.
- Tolins, Jackson. 2013. “Assessment and Direction Through Nonlexical Vocalizations
 in Music Instruction.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46 (1):
 47–64.
- Walsh, Steve. 2011. *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. Abingdon:
 Routledge.
- Weeks, Peter. 1985. “Error-correction Techniques and Sequences in Instructional
 Settings: Toward a Comparative Framework.” *Human Studies* 8 (3): 195–233.
- Weeks, Peter. 1996. “A Rehearsal of a Beethoven Passage: An Analysis of Correction
 Talk.” *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 29 (3): 247–290.
- Wells, Gordon. 1999. *Dialogic Inquiry: Towards a Sociocultural Practice and Theory
 of Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions (adapted from Selting et al. 2011)

Pauses and lengthening

(.)	micro-pause
(-)	macro-pause
: : :	lengthening

Accents

ACcent	primary pitch accent
Accent	secondary pitch accent

Phrase-final pitch movements

?	rise-to-high
,	rise-to-mid
-	level
;	fall-to-mid
.	fall-to-low

Breathing

.h, .hh, .hhh	in-breath
h., hh., hhh.	out-breath

Physical movement – examples:

<<nodding>>
<<walking off stage>>
<<pointing at P>>

Other conventions

[overlapping talk
[